

**REMARKS**

The Examiner objected to the title as not being descriptive or clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. Applicant has amended the title to "Power Supply Power Event Notification." Claim 1 is directed to an event notification system for a plurality of power supplies coupled to a computer network. Independent claim 14 is directed to a notification system for a plurality of power supplies coupled to a computer network. Independent claim 27 is directed to a method of providing over a computer network connected to a plurality of power supplies a notification of a predetermined event one of the plurality of power supplies. Independent claim 43 is directed to an article of manufacture that includes computer readable program code means for causing the computer system to send over the computer network an electronic notification including information relating to the occurrence of the predetermined event and the number of the power supplies to which the event occurred. Applicants respectfully assert that the new title is descriptive.

Claim 27 stands rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as indefinite. Applicants have amended claim 27 as suggested by the Examiner.

Claims 1-44 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP application with Publication No. 11-259185 (Ishizawa) in view of JP application with Publication No. 2000-078224 (Sakai). Applicant respectfully asserts that the claims as originally filed are not obvious in view of Ishizawa in view of Sakai.


Ishizawa in view of Sakai fails to teach, disclose, or suggest at least the computer system configured to send an electronic notification as recited in claim 1 and its dependent claims. Independent claim 1 recites a computer network that is coupled to a plurality of power supplies and to a computer system. The computer system is configured to determine if an event has occurred at the power supplies, and to send an electronic notification to a predetermined location, with the notification including information about the number of the power supplies to which the event occurred. Ishizawa apparently (the computer-generated translation is of poor quality) discusses a system with a system with UPSs whose operating state may be individually monitored. Sakai apparently discusses reporting status from a single UPS using email. Combining Sakai with Ishizawa would yield a system where the UPSs in Ishizawa could each

report its own status via email. There is no teaching or suggestion to provide a notification as to the number of the UPSs to which an event has occurred. Claim 1, however, recites that the computer system can determine the occurrence of an event and send an electronic notification of the number of power supplies to which the event occurred. Further, from the transcription, there is no teaching in Ishizawa of a computer system adapted to compare data from power supplies with data of an event to determine if the event has occurred. For at least these reason, independent claim 1, and claims 2-13 that depend directly or indirectly from claim 1, are patentable over Ishizawa in view of Sakai.

Independent claims 14, 27, and 43 are also not taught, disclosed, or suggested by Ishizawa in view of Sakai. Claim 14 recites a computer system including means for comparing data from power supplies with data of an event to determine if an event has occurred and means for sending an e-mail that includes information about the number of power supplies, connected to a network, to which an event occurred. Claim 27 recites a method providing a notification of an event over a computer network including comparing data from a power supply with data of an event to determine if an event occurred and sending an electronic notification including information relating to the number of power supplies, connected to the network, to which the event occurred. Claim 43 recites an article of manufacture including computer readable program code means for causing a computer system to send an electronic notification including information relating to the number of power supplies, connected to a network, to which an event occurred. Further, claim 44, that depends from claim 43, further recites computer readable program means for causing the computer system to compare data from a power supply with at least one threshold value to determine if the event occurred. Thus, independent claims 14, 27, and 43, and claims 15-26, 28-42, and 44, that depend directly or indirectly from claims 14, 27, and 43, are patentable over Ishizawa in view of Sakai for reasons similar to those discussed above.

Based on the foregoing, this application is believed to be in allowable condition, and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to call the Applicants' Attorney at the number provided below with any questions.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Shane H. Hunter  
Registration No. 41,858  
Attorneys for Applicants  
Mintz, Levin, Cohn, Ferris,  
Glovsky and Popeo, P.C.  
One Financial Center  
Boston, MA 02111  
Telephone 617/348-1765  
**Customer No. 30623**

Date: July 28, 2004

TRA 1943279v1